

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, OPENAI, INC.,  
OPENAI LP, OPENAI GP, LLC, OPENAI, LLC,  
OPENAI OPCO LLC, OPENAI GLOBAL LLC,  
OAI CORPORATION, LLC, and OPENAI  
HOLDINGS, LLC,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.  
1:23-cv-11195 (SHS) (OTW)

DAILY NEWS, LP; THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE  
COMPANY, LLC; ORLANDO SENTINEL  
COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC; SUN-  
SENTINEL COMPANY, LLC; SAN JOSE  
MERCURY-NEWS, LLC; DP MEDIA NETWORK,  
LLC; ORB PUBLISHING, LLC; AND  
NORTHWEST PUBLICATIONS, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICROSOFT CORPORATION, OPENAI, INC.,  
OPENAI LP, OPENAI GP, LLC, OPENAI, LLC,  
OPENAI OPCO LLC, OPENAI GLOBAL LLC,  
OAI CORPORATION, LLC, and OPENAI  
HOLDINGS, LLC,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.  
1:24-cv-03285 (SHS) (OTW)

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY IN OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO DISMISS**

Plaintiffs The New York Times Company; Daily News, LP; The Chicago Tribune Company, LLC; Orlando Sentinel Communications Company, LLC; Sun-Sentinel Company, LLC; San Jose Mercury-News, LLC; DP Media Network, LLC; ORB Publishing, LLC; and Northwest

Publications, LLC (collectively “Plaintiffs”), by and through their undersigned counsel, respectfully submit this Notice of Supplemental Authority to apprise the Court of a recent order that further supports Plaintiffs’ Oppositions to Defendants’ pending Motions to Dismiss.<sup>1</sup>

Following his “bottom-line order” issued on November 21, 2024, in *The Intercept Media, Inc. v. OpenAI et al.*, No. 24-cv-01515-JSR (S.D.N.Y.), Judge Rakoff issued an opinion and order on February 20, 2025, allowing The Intercept’s claim under 17 U.S.C. § 1202(b)(1) to proceed against OpenAI. *See* Opinion and Order, *The Intercept Media*, No. 24-cv-01515-JSR, Dkt. 127 (the “Order”). The Order is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Judge Rakoff found that The Intercept pleaded a concrete injury sufficient to confer Article III standing because “Intercept’s claims in this case implicate the same kind of property-based harms traditionally actionable in copyright,” Order at 14, and “the harm faced by The Intercept—in the form of defendants’ alleged interference with its property right—implicates the same incentives to create that justify traditional copyright,” *id.* at 16. Here, in addition to copyright infringement claims, Plaintiffs have alleged very similar Section 1202(b)(1) claims arising from Defendants’ removal of CMI from Plaintiffs’ copyrighted news articles contained in the training datasets. *Compare id.* at 18-19 (“The Intercept specifically alleges that defendants removed CMI from its articles reproduced in the training sets, which concealed their own systematic practice of copyright infringement and facilitates infringement by ChatGPT users.”) *with Daily News Compl.* (Dkt. 1 in Case No. 24-cv-03285) at ¶ 159 (“The Defendants knew that by removing the Publishers’ CMI, the CMI would not be retained within the GPT models and/or displayed when the GenAI

---

<sup>1</sup> OpenAI’s Motion to Dismiss and Microsoft’s Motion to Dismiss against The Times are filed at Dkt. 51 and 64, respectively, and The Times’s Oppositions to those Motions are filed at Dkt. 73 and 76, respectively, in case No. 23-cv-11195. Microsoft’s Motion to Dismiss and OpenAI’s Motion to Dismiss against the *Daily News* Plaintiffs are filed at Dkt. 76 and 80, respectively, and the *Daily News* Plaintiffs’ Oppositions to those Motions are filed at Dkt. 98 and 100, respectively, in case No. 24-cv-03285.

products disseminate unauthorized copies of the Publishers’ Works to end-users, and thereby would conceal the Defendants’ own infringement as well as induce, enable, facilitate, or conceal end-users’ infringement resulting from their operation of the Defendants’ GenAI products.”) and *The New York Times* First Am. Compl. (Dkt. 170 in Case No. 23-cv-11195) at ¶ 125; *see also Daily News* Compl. (Dkt. 1) at ¶¶ 160-163 (discussing Dragnet and Newspaper content extractors).

Turning to the merits of the claims, Judge Rakoff found that The Intercept sufficiently pleaded a Section 1202(b)(1) claim based on OpenAI’s knowledge of “downstream infringement,” namely, “its facilitation of ChatGPT users’ downstream infringement of regurgitations of its articles produced in ChatGPT outputs.” Order at 22-24. This theory of downstream infringement is also present in Plaintiffs’ Complaints. *See, e.g., Daily News* Compl. ¶¶ 160-169; *see id.* ¶ 168 (citing example of regurgitated output that “expressly encourages an end-user to republish a copy of a New York *Daily News* article”); *The New York Times* First Am. Compl. ¶¶ 186-187.

Judge Rakoff, however, dismissed The Intercept’s Section 1202(b)(1) claim against Microsoft because The Intercept’s complaint did not include “the factual specificity supporting The Intercept’s § 1202(b)(1) claim against OpenAI (e.g., . . . the examples of regurgitations).” Order at 25. By contrast, Plaintiffs’ Complaints contain specific examples of output of Plaintiffs’ articles from Microsoft’s Copilot product with Plaintiffs’ CMI removed. *See, e.g., Daily News* Compl. ¶¶ 165 (citing example output “containing the entire text of [a] New York *Daily News* article”), 168 (citing example output that “expressly encourages an end-user to republish a copy of a New York *Daily News* article”); *see also The New York Times* First Am. Compl. ¶¶ 112, 115.

Finally, Judge Rakoff dismissed The Intercept’s Section 1202(b)(3) claims against both Microsoft and OpenAI because the complaint “includes no factual support for its allegation that Microsoft and OpenAI distributed its articles”—or more specifically, that Microsoft shared copies

of The Intercept's articles without CMI with the OpenAI defendants, or vice versa. Order at 26. By contrast, Plaintiffs allege Section 1202(b)(3) claims based on the output from Defendants' products of Plaintiffs' articles with the CMI removed. *See, e.g., Daily News* Compl. ¶¶ 165, 168 and Exhibit J; *The New York Times* First Am. Compl. ¶¶ 112, 115, 118, and Exhibit J. The Order does not address this theory of liability under Section 1202(b)(3) because The Intercept did not plead it.

Dated: February 21, 2025

/s/ Ian Crosby

Ian Crosby (*pro hac vice*)  
 Genevieve Vose Wallace (*pro hac vice*)  
 Katherine M. Peaslee (*pro hac vice*)  
 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
 401 Union Street, Suite 3000  
 Seattle, WA 98101  
 Telephone: (206) 516-3880  
 Facsimile: (206) 516-3883  
 icrosby@susmangodfrey.com  
 gwallace@susmangodfrey.com  
 kpeaslee@susmangodfrey.com

Davida Brook (*pro hac vice*)  
 Emily K. Cronin (*pro hac vice*)  
 Ellie Dupler (*pro hac vice*)  
 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
 1900 Ave of the Stars, Suite 1400  
 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 Telephone: (310) 789-3100  
 Facsimile: (310) 789-3150  
 dbrook@susmangodfrey.com  
 ecronin@susmangodfrey.com  
 edupler@susmangodfrey.com

Elisha Barron (5036850)  
 Zachary B. Savage (ZS2668)  
 Tamar Lusztig (5125174)  
 Alexander Frawley (5564539)  
 Eudokia Spanos (5021381)  
 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
 One Manhattan West  
 New York, NY 10001

Telephone: (212) 336-8330  
Facsimile: (212) 336-8340  
ebarron@susmangodfrey.com  
zsavage@susmangodfrey.com  
tlusztig@susmangodfrey.com  
afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  
espanos@susmangodfrey.com

Scarlett Collings (4985602)  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5100  
Houston, TX 77002  
Telephone: (713) 651-9366  
Facsimile (713) 654-6666  
scollings@susmangodfrey.com

Steven Lieberman (SL8687)  
Jennifer B. Maisel (5096995)  
Kristen J. Logan (*pro hac vice*)  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.  
901 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 900 East  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 783-6040  
Facsimile: (202) 783 6031  
slieberman@rothwellfigg.com  
jmaisel@rothwellfigg.com  
klogan@rothwellfigg.com

***Attorneys for Plaintiff  
The New York Times Company***

/s/ Steven Lieberman

Steven Lieberman (SL8687)  
Jennifer B. Maisel (5096995)  
Robert Parker (*pro hac vice*)  
Jenny L. Colgate (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael Jones (*pro hac vice*)  
Mark Rawls (*pro hac vice*)  
Kristen J. Logan (*pro hac vice*)  
Bryan B. Thompson (6004147)  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST &  
MANBECK, P.C.  
901 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 900 East  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 783-6040  
Facsimile: (202) 783-6031

slieberman@rothwellfigg.com  
jmaisel@rothwellfigg.com  
rparker@rothwellfigg.com  
jcolgate@rothwellfigg.com  
mjones@rothwellfigg.com  
mrawls@rothwellfigg.com  
klogan@rothwellfigg.com  
bthompson@rothwellfigg.com

Jeffrey A. Lindenbaum (JL1971)  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST &  
MANBECK, P.C.  
3 Manhattanville Road, Suite 105  
Purchase, New York 10577  
Telephone: (202) 783-6040  
Facsimile: (202) 783-6031  
jlindenbaum@rothwellfigg.com

***Attorneys for Plaintiffs***  
***Daily News, LP; The Chicago Tribune Company,***  
***LLC; Orlando Sentinel Communications***  
***Company, LLC; Sun-Sentinel Company, LLC;***  
***San Jose Mercury-News, LLC; DP Media***  
***Network, LLC; ORB Publishing, LLC; and***  
***Northwest Publications, LLC***